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• Depicted are responses that were answered using a 5-point Likert Scale
• SA & IA represent ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Inclined to Agree’
• Neither represents ‘Neither Agree nor Disagree’
• SD & ID represent ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘Inclined to Disagree’
• Slides follow order of on-line survey
Demog3: Primary Area of Job Responsibility – Reviewers’ Responses

- Accreditation Reviewer: 6
- Other: 3
- No Response: 10

Total: 22
SA1: Self Assessment Useful Tool for Identifying Areas Needing Improvement - Reviewers’ Responses

N=19, 0 ‘no response’
SA= 6, IA = 8, Neither = 3, ID =2, ID = 0
SA2: Self Assessment Process
Useful in Preparing for On-site Review-
Reviewers’ Responses

N=19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 11, Neither = 0, ID = 2, SD = 0
SA3: Self Assessment Process is Catalyst for Pre-review Consultation-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 4, IA = 9, Neither = 2, IA = 4, SD = 0
OSR1: On-site Review Can Be Improved by LPHD Evaluation of State Agency Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 4, IA = 8, Neither = 2, ID = 2, SD = 3
OSR2: On-site Review Process Can Be Improved By Increasing Exit Interviews-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 18, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 8, IA = 5, Neither = 2, ID = 3, SD = 1
OSR3: On-site Review is Opportunity for Constructive Program Related Dialogue- Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 14, IA = 3, Neither = 0, ID = 2, SD = 0
OSR4: Program Reviewers Have Good Understanding of Accreditation Standards- Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’

SA = 10, IA = 8, Neither = 0, ID = 1, SD = 0
OSR5: All Reviewers Apply Accreditation Standards the Same Way-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 10, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 3, IA = 10, Neither = 2, ID = 3, SD = 1
OSR6: Same Program Reviewer Applies Accreditation Standard Same Way at Each LPHD-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 9, IA = 8, Neither = 1, ID = 1, SD = 0
OSR7: Presence of Program Specific Peer Reviewer Would Improve On-Site Review Process - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 9, Neither = 5, ID = 3, SD = 0
OSSR1: On-site Review Report Assists the LPHD As a Tool for Performance Improvement—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 13, IA = 5, Neither = 1, SD & ID = 0
OSSR2: On-site Review Report Would Be Improved By More Use of Special Recognition Section - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 1, IA = 5, Neither = 9, ID = 4, SD = 0
OSSR3: On-site Review Report Would Be Improved By More Use of Recommendation for Improvement Section—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’

SA = 6, IA = 6, Neither = 6, ID = 1, SD = 0
CPA1: Correction Plan of Action Serves As Useful Mechanism for Continuous Improvement- Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 10, Neither = 0, ID = 2, SD = 0
CPA2: CPA Process Can Best Be Improved By a Shorter Time Frame for Implementation - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 1, IA = 7, Neither = 6, ID = 4, SD = 1
CPA3: CPA Process Would Benefit From Improved Communication Between Program Reviewers and LPHD Staff-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 5, IA = 7, Neither = 6, ID = 1, SD = 0
Tool1: Accreditation Tool Should Focus More on Achievable Optimal Performance Standards - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 18, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 1, IA = 5, Neither = 2, ID = 4, SD = 6
Tool 2: “Accreditation with Commendation” is Reflective of Enhanced Program Capacity - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SD = 2, IA = 4, Neither = 4, ID = 8, SD = 1
Tool3: Formatting of the Accreditation Tool Meets User Needs—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’

SA = 5, IA = 6, Neither = 6, ID = 1, SD = 1
Tool4: Standards in the Tool Are Written Clearly and Concisely - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 4, IA = 11, Neither = 1, ID = 3, SD = 0
Tool5: Accreditation Tool is Useful Mechanism for Annual LPHD Program Planning Activities - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 12, Neither = 4, ID = 1, SD = 0
TA1: Current Technical Assistance Resource Contributes to Quality Improvement of Programs - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 6, Neither = 8, ID = 3, SD = 0
TA3: Accreditation Program Website is a Valuable Resource—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 4, IA = 5, Neither = 7, ID = 3, SD = 0
AP1: Purpose of Accreditation Process Should Be On-going
Quality Improvement - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 13, IA = 3, Neither = 2, ID = 1, SD = 0
AP2: Purpose of Accreditation Process Should Be Contract Compliance - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 7, Neither = 2, ID = 3, SD = 1
AP3: Accreditation Process Reflects a Set of Achievable Standards - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 10, IA = 8, Neither = 1, SD & IA = 0
AP4: Accreditation Process Can Be Improved by Increased Focus on Recommendations for Performance Improvement - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 7, IA = 8, Neither = 4, SD & ID = 0
AP5: Is Important for Agencies to Seek Funds to Conduct an Outside Objective Evaluation of Accreditation Program

Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 1, IA = 4, Neither = 6, ID = 7, SD = 1
AP6: Overall, Accreditation Process Has Improved Program Performance of LPHD-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 9, IA = 10, Neither = 0, SD & ID = 0
AP7: Accreditation Process is Useful for Internal LPHD Program Evaluation Tool - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 10, IA = 7, Neither = 1, ID = 1, SD = 0
AP8: Accreditation Should Be Based On All State-Funded Services Included in Process-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 7, Neither = 4, ID = 1, SD = 1
AP9: Accreditation Should Be Based on Minimum Set of Services That Every LPHD Must Provide-

Reviewers’ Responses

N = 18, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 8, Neither = 5, IA = 2, SD = 1
NtWk1: Establishment of APSN Would Improve Accreditation Process - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 0, IA = 12, Neither = 5, ID = 2, SD = 0
NtWk2: I would seek program guidance from peer network for purpose of achieving accreditation.

Reviewers’ Responses

- SA & IA: 20.00%
- Neither: 60.00%
- SD & ID: 20.00%

N = 18, 1 'no response'
SA = 0, IA = 7, Neither = 9, ID = 1, SD = 1
NtWk3: I would serve on and/or share resources with a peer network -

Reviewers’ Responses

SA & IA Neither SD & ID

N = 18, 1 'no response'
SA = 4, IA = 7, Neither = 5, ID = 1, SD = 1

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 11, Neither = 2, SD & ID = 0
BP2: I would seek program guidance from BP Directory for purpose of achieving accreditation.

Reviewers’ Responses

N = 18, 1 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 6, Neither = 5, ID = 1, SD = 0
BP3: I would share results with the Best Practice Directory—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 8, IA = 10, Neither = 1, SD & ID = 0
Train1: Additional Training on the Accreditation Process is Needed for LPHDs—Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 6, IA = 5, Neither = 5, ID = 3, SD = 0
Train2: Additional Training on Accreditation Process is Needed for Program Reviewers - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 3, IA = 8, Neither = 2, ID = 5, SD =1
Comm1: I am familiar with the membership and purview of the Accreditation Commission - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 5, Neither = 5, ID = 6, SD = 1
Comm2: There Is Adequate Representation of LDH on the Commission-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 2 ‘no response’
SA = 2, IA = 4, Neither = 10, ID = 1, SD = 0
Comm3: Current Communication Between the Commission and Accreditation Process Stakeholders is Adequate - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 0, IA = 1, Neither = 11, ID = 4, SD = 0
MPHI1: I understand MPHI’s role in the accreditation process-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 19, 0 ‘no response’
SA = 7, IA = 11, Neither = 1, SD & ID = 0
MPHI2: Coordination of Accreditation Program is Enhanced by MPHI’s Participation-
Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 6, IA = 7, Neither = 2, ID = 1, SD = 0
MPHI3: Processes for which MPHI is Responsible are Handled in a Satisfactory Manner - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 6, IA = 6, Neither = 3, ID = 0, SD = 1
NPHPS1: I am familiar with the CDC National Public Health Performance Standards-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 2, IA = 4, Neither = 1, ID = 5, SD = 4
NPHPS2: Accreditation for Commendation for LPHDs Should Be Tied to Use of NPHPS-Reviewers’ Responses

N = 16, 3 ‘no responses’
SA = 1, IA = 7, Neither = 7, IA = 0, SD = 1
NPHPS3: NPHPS for LPHDs Should Be Incorporated into the Accreditation Program in a Subsequent Cycle - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 15, 4 “no responses”
SA = 0, IA = 5, Neither = 8, ID = 1, SD = 1
MD1: I am familiar with the indicators that address medical directors-

**Reviewers’ Responses**

N = 15, 4 ‘no responses’

SA = 3, IA = 2, Neither = 2, ID = 4, SD = 4
MD2: Indicators in the Administration Section of the Accreditation Tool are Sufficient to Address Medical Director Competencies - Reviewers’ Responses

N = 15, 4 ‘no responses’
SA = 0, IA = 2, Neither = 11, ID = 2, SD = 0